

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to the Office Action dated January 18, 2007. All rejections and objections of the Examiner are respectfully traversed. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

At paragraphs 1-2 of the Office Action, the Examiner required restriction to one of three claim groups. Applicants have elected without traverse Group I, consisting of claims 1-17, for Examination in this application, reserving the right to pursue any of the other claims in one or more divisional or continuation applications. Accordingly, all other claims have been cancelled without prejudice or dedication herein.

At paragraph 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claim 8. Claim 8 has been cancelled herein.

At paragraph 4 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 1-15 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 101. Claims 1-15 and 17 have been cancelled herein.

At paragraph 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-7 and 16-17 for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103, citing U.S. Patent No. 6,351,777 of Simonoff ("Simonoff") and U.S. Patent No. 6,201,859 of Memhard et al. ("Memhard et al."). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Simonoff discloses a dedicated White Board system facilitating collaboration between a plurality of users, and generating an object placement tool for generating predetermined objects which are displayable at user-selected locations on a White Board screen, including a filter device permitting selective transmission of predetermined, active hyperlink, text, active track, and freehand drawing objects to users.

Memhard et al. disclose controlling participant input in a conferencing environment supporting at least first and second end points which can operate in at least two different modes. While in the first operating mode, the end points of Memhard et al. can make changes to the conference data at will. The Memhard et al. conference remains in the first operating mode until a request is received from a participant to change the conference to a second operating mode. Once this request is received, the Memhard et al. conference switches to the second operating mode. While in the second operating mode, only one of the first and second end points in Memhard et al. can make changes at any particular time.

Nothing in the combination of Simonoff and Memhard et al. discloses or suggests a method, performed at a requesting client device and an object server device coupled to the client device, for maintaining a copy of an object associated with an item of information, the item of information being accessed by other client devices coupled to the server device, the object including a data structure storing the item of information, including the steps of:

forwarding a modification request from the requesting client device to the coupled object server device, the modification request for modifying at least one attribute of the object associated with the item of information, wherein the at least one attribute is one of a plurality of attributes of the object apportioned into general entries and variable entries, the general entries including a list of member client devices having access to the object and participating in a persistent real-time conferencing session represented by the object, and the variable entries including a plurality of items of persistent information associated with the object, wherein the general entries are defined by the object server device, and the variable entries of the object data structure are defined and managed by any of the member client devices having access to the object;

receiving, at the object server device, the modification request from the requesting client device;

determining whether the requesting client device is authorized to modify the at least one attribute of the object associated with the item of information by determining if the requesting client device is contained within the list of member client devices;

in the event that the requesting client device is not within the list of member client devices, sending an indication that the modification request was not granted to the client device;

in the event that the client device is indicated in the list of member client devices, the object server device modifying the object in accordance with the modification request, sending a response package to the requesting client device including a copy of the modified object, *broadcasting a notification package to member client devices in the list of member client devices that are also subscribed to receive such notification packages regarding modifications to the at least one attribute of the object associated with the item of information and that are also currently connected to the object server to share data and collaborate in real-time, not broadcasting the notification package to member client devices in the list of member client devices that are not subscribed to receive such notification packages regarding modifications to the at least one attribute of the object associated with the item of information, and not broadcasting the notification package to member client devices in the list of member client devices that are not currently connected to the object server to share data and collaborate in real-time;*

receiving, at the requesting client device in the response package from the object server device, the copy of the modified object, the copy of the modified object reflecting the requested modification; and

replacing the object at the requesting client device with the updated copy. (emphasis added)

as in the present claim 16. In contrast, the filter device of Simonoff operates to filter transmission of *hyperlinks* and *drawing objects* based on *user privilege levels*, while the Memhard et al. system describes switching between modes to control which users can make changes and the use of a token to further control the making of changes by users. Nothing in either Simonoff or Memhard et al. includes even a hint or suggestion of permitting the selective broadcasting of the present claim 16 based on a member list contained in the object, object attribute level modification subscription and whether a client device is currently connected to an object server for sharing data and collaborating in real time.

Accordingly, for the above reasons, Applicants respectfully urge that the combination of Simonoff and Memhard et al. does not disclose or suggest all the features of the present claim 16.

The combination of Simonoff and Memhard et al., therefore does not support a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicants have amended claim 16 and cancelled the remaining claims from further consideration in this application. Applicants are not conceding in this application that those claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the present claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of allowable subject matter. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue these and other claims in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Applicants' Attorney at the number listed below so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

June 1, 2007
Date

/David Dagg/
David A. Dagg Reg. No. 37,809
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
McGuinness & Manaras LLP
125 Nagog Park
Acton, MA 01720
(617) 630-1131